DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 256 559 RC 015 275

AUTHOR Haenn, Joseph F.
TITLE Analysis of Project MERLIN Scopes and Topics Checklist.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Dept. of Education, Harrisburg.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (ED), Washington, DC. Migrant Education Programs.
PUB DATE 11 Oct 84
NOTE 21p.; For related document, see ED 245 855.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classification; *Data Analysis; *Databases; Human Resources; *Migrant Education; Migrant Health Services; Migrant Programs; *Online Systems; Resource Materials; *Subject Index Terms
IDENTIFIERS Migrant Educ Resources List Information Network

ABSTRACT

The computerized database of Project MERLIN (Migrant Education Resource List Information Network) contains information about people, programs, and written materials, and a survey was designed to determine whether MERLIN's listing of scopes and topics was appropriate for classifying the database's content. The survey was distributed to MERLIN's consortium members (16 state departments of education and 3 national clearinghouses with migrant interests) and others knowledgeable about migrant health and/or education. Twenty-five respondents completed the survey (11 consortium members; 14 others). Respondents were asked to rate each of the 12 chosen scopes and each of the topics within each scope on a 5-point scale ranging from definitely change to definitely not change. Based on the responses, the following scopes were identified as needing major revision: Administration, Cultural Studies, Dropout Prevention, Educational Programs, Parent and Community Involvement, and Special Education. Career Education, English as a Second Language, Bilingual Education, Health and Human Services, Identification and Recruitment, and Vocational Education were the scopes identified as needing minor revision. The Migrant Student Record Transfer System scope did not need any changes. It was suggested that the ERIC thesaurus be used as the basis for the categorization and retrieval system, replacing the current scopes and topics. (PM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Pennsylvania Migrant Education

Pennsylvania Department of Education
MERLIN, 8th Floor
333 Market St., P.O. Box 911
Harrisburg, Pa. 17108
(717) 783-7121

Merlin

Migrant Education Resource List Information Network

ED256559

APR 1985
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

Analysis of Project MERLIN Scopes and Topics Checklist

Joseph F. Haenn

October 11, 1984

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC015275

Interstate – 1-800-233-0306
Pennsylvania – 1-800-222-1930

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Analysis of Project MERLIN Scopes and Topics Checklist

Project MERLIN is funded by the Office of Migrant Education of the United States Department of Education. Administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, the project is a consortium of representatives from state departments of education and migrant health centers to establish a computerized database designed to contain information about people, programs and written materials available to educators and health personnel in migrant programs. This report summarizes the results of analysis of a survey administered to Consortium members and other participants in a recent Consortium meeting. The survey was designed to determine whether a listing of scopes and topics was appropriate to categorize the people, programs and written materials within the database.

Respondents rated each topic and subtopic within each of the twelve scopes, plus made extensive comments. Based on these responses, six scopes were identified which need major revisions: Administration, Cultural Studies, Dropout Prevention, Educational Programs, Parent and Community Involvement, and Special Education. In five other scopes, minor revisions are needed: Career Education, English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education, Health and Human Services, Identification and Recruitment, and Vocational Education. The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) scope does not need any changes. In addition, there needs to be better articulation between the scopes of Career Education, Dropout Prevention and Vocational Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Executive Summary	i
List of Tables	iii
Introduction	1
Survey of Scopes and Topics	1
Limitations of the Survey	2
Results	3
Administration	3
Career Education	4
Cultural Studies	5
Dropout Prevention, Credit Accrual and Graduation	6
Educational Programs	7
English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education	9
Health and Human Services	10
Identification and Recruitment	11
MSRTS	12
Parent and Community Involvement	13
Special Education	14
Vocational Education	15
Summary	16

Appendices

A. Survey of Project MERLIN Scopes and Topics	A-1
B. Survey Responses	B-1

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Administration Scope Ratings	4
2.	Career Education Scope Ratings	5
3.	Cultural Studies Scope Ratings	5
4.	Dropout Prevention Scope Ratings	6
5.	Educational Programs Scope Ratings	8
6.	Bilingual Education Scope Ratings	10
7.	Health and Human Services Scope Ratings	11
8.	Identification and Recruitment Scope Ratings	12
9.	MSRTS Scope Ratings	12
10.	Parent Involvement Scope Ratings	13
11.	Special Education Scope Ratings	14
12.	Vocational Education Scope Ratings	15

Analysis of Project MERLIN Scopes and Topics Checklist

Project MERLIN (Migrant Education Resource List Information Network) is a federally funded project designed to improve interstate and intrastate coordination of migrant education activities through the development of a comprehensive national database of educational resources in a range of scopes relevant to the many needs of a migrant population. Originally begun in 1982, MERLIN is funded by the Office of Migrant Education of the United States Department of Education under the provisions of Section 143c of Chapter 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education, the project is a consortium of representatives from state departments of education and migrant health centers to establish a computerized database designed to contain information about people, programs and written materials available to educators and health personnel in migrant programs. Participating Consortium members include the states of Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Virginia, plus the Educational Research Information Center/Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools (ERIC/CRESS), the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education and the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (M.S.R.T.S.).

Survey of Scopes and Topics

As a result of suggestions made by users of the MERLIN system across the nation, this survey was designed to ascertain the most appropriate system of scopes and topics to classify the people, programs and written materials within the MERLIN database. A copy of the survey form is included as Appendix A. The twelve scopes on the survey form were:

- Administration
- Career Education
- Cultural Studies
- Dropout Prevention, Credit Accrual and Graduation

- o Educational Programs
- o English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education
- o Health and Human Services
- o Identification and Recruitment
- o MSRTS
- o Parent and Community Involvement
- o Special Education
- o Vocational Education

The number of topics under each scope ranged from 3 to 17, with several of the topics having subtopics as well. Respondents were to rate each topic and subtopic based on their perception as to whether that topic or subtopic should be included under its assigned scope as the framework for cataloging-- and ultimately retrieving-- the people, programs and written materials contained within the MERLIN database.

Each topic and subtopic were to be rated on the following five-point scale:

1 - Definitely change
2 - Probably change
3 - Undecided
4 - Probably not change
5 - Definitely not change

Respondents were free to add additional topics or subtopics, delete existing topics or subtopics, or make any other comments they felt might contribute to the development of the classification/retrieval framework.

This report summarizes the results of analysis of the Survey of Scopes and Topics after it was administered to Consortium members and other participants in a Consortium meeting held in Philadelphia in early September, 1984.

Limitations of the Survey

The response key for the original survey had the coding for categories "3" and "5" reversed. However, instructions given to correct this problem before administration of the survey appeared to be adequate as all respondents responded correctly.

Where a topic had subtopics as well, some respondents rated only the topic and left the subtopics blank. Since it was assumed that the respondent was applying the topical rating to each of the subtopics, the scores were analyzed as such. Also, since the topics seemed redundant with subtopics subsumed under them, in these cases only the subtopic ratings were analyzed.

Respondents were given the option of omitting the ratings of topics, subtopics or even whole scopes where they felt they had insufficient knowledge to rate that area.

Results

A total of 25 respondents completed the survey, with 11 of these being Consortium members and the other 14 being persons in attendance at the meeting possessing expertise in migrant health and/or education. Results will be presented for each scope separately, with a general discussion following.

During the discussions which follow, a topic or subtopic which received an average rating of 4.00 or above (on a five-point scale) was considered to be in the "not change" area. The discussions will focus on those topics and subtopics rated below an average of 4.00, with comments used to expand upon these ratings and to make recommendations about the scope in general. Other comments will be utilized when mentioned by two or more respondents, or if they suggest addition of a new topic or subtopic.

Administration

The results of analyses of the ratings for both groups of respondents on this scope are presented in Table 1. Both subtopics under topic 11 (Public speakers) and topic 7 (Needs assessment) were rated below 4.00 by the Consortium members. Non-consortium members rated three topics with a mean below 4.00: 1 (Federal policy/regulations), 12 (Pupil accounting) and 15 (Student data exchange).

One respondent said subtopics 11a&b were "not useful categories." Another feels this topic could be put under each scope.

At least two respondents were unsure to what topic 7 referred. It needs to be determined to what levels this and several other topics refer. Five respondents feel levels must be identified (e.g., federal, state, local, general public) for topics 1 (Federal policy/regulations), 2 (Fiscal management/funds allocation), 5 (Interagency coordination) and 8 (Program development). In addition, three respondents suggested renaming topic 8 to "Program development/ management."

Four respondents were unsure what topic 12 means, another suggested adding subtopics to the topic and it was mentioned in the large group discussion that a separate category may not be needed for this topic. Topic 15 also was unclear to one respondent ("...is this MSRTS?"), while

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1
Project MERLIN Administration Scope Ratings

Administration Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Federal policy/regulations	11	1	5	4.00	1.55	12	1	5	3.67	1.56
2. Fiscal management/funds allocation	11	1	5	4.09	1.3C	12	1	5	4.00	1.35
3. Identification/recruitment	11	1	5	4.45	1.21	11	1	5	4.45	1.21
4. Information dissemination	11	2	5	4.27	1.10	12	2	5	4.50	0.90
5. Interagency coordination	11	1	5	4.36	1.29	12	2	5	4.58	0.90
6. Interstate coordination	11	2	5	4.18	1.08	12	2	5	4.58	0.90
7. Needs assessment	11	1	5	3.55	1.57	11	2	5	4.18	1.17
8. Program development										
a. exemplary/innovative programs	9	1	5	4.22	1.30	12	4	5	4.58	0.51
b. regular school year programs	10	3	5	4.40	0.70	12	4	5	4.58	0.51
c. summer programs	9	1	5	4.11	1.36	12	4	5	4.58	0.51
9. Program evaluation	11	4	5	4.91	0.30	12	2	5	4.25	1.14
10. Proposal writing	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	11	2	5	4.36	0.92
11. Public speakers										
a. keynote/large group	10	1	5	3.60	1.71	11	3	5	4.27	0.65
b. small group	10	1	5	3.60	1.71	11	3	5	4.27	0.65
12. Pupil accounting	11	3	5	4.27	0.90	10	1	5	3.20	1.62
13. Section 143C projects	10	2	5	4.00	1.15	11	2	5	4.09	1.14
14. Staff development										
a. evaluation	9	1	5	4.22	1.39	12	1	5	4.17	1.34
b. inservice	9	3	5	4.44	0.88	11	1	5	4.09	1.38
15. Student data exchange	11	1	5	4.18	1.25	10	1	5	3.90	1.60

another suggested adding subtopics. Other topics for which subtopics were suggested are topics 10 (Proposal writing) and 13 (Section 143c projects).

It was suggested during the large group discussion that this scope be changed to "Administration/Supervision." In addition, the following new topics were suggested:

- Record management (3 respondents)
- Supervision (3)
- Alternative funding sources
- Monitoring/program accountability
- Personnel supervision
- Program management

Career Education

The average ratings for each group for the scope Career Education are presented in Table 2. There were no topics or subtopics for either group which were rated with an average below 4.00. In fact, only subtopics 1b&d (for non-Consortium members) and topic 6 (for Consortium members) were rated below 4.25 on the average.

TABLE 2
Project MERLIN Career Education Scope Ratings

Career Education Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Career education curriculum										
a. career awareness	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	12	4	5	4.50	0.52
b. decision making	10	2	5	4.60	0.97	13	1	5	4.08	1.04
c. exploration	10	2	5	4.50	1.08	11	4	5	4.45	0.52
d. counseling	10	3	5	4.70	0.67	12	1	5	4.08	1.08
e. planning	10	3	5	4.70	0.67	11	4	5	4.45	0.52
2. Career exploration for LEP students	10	3	5	4.60	0.70	11	3	5	4.36	0.67
3. Evaluation and assessment	11	3	5	4.27	0.79	12	3	5	4.33	0.65
4. Experience-based education	11	4	5	4.55	0.52	12	4	5	4.50	0.52
5. Job seeking skills	11	3	5	4.55	0.69	12	4	5	4.42	0.51
6. Overcoming bias and stereotyping	11	1	5	4.09	1.45	12	2	5	4.25	0.87
7. Work habits and values	11	3	5	4.55	0.69	12	4	5	4.50	0.52

However, two respondents found topic 1d (counseling) to be unclear. Two other respondents mentioned that the term was misleading so as to suggest that non-counselors (e.g. teachers or tutors) have acquired the counseling skills needed to work in this area. It was suggested by five respondents and during the large group discussion that this subtopic be renamed "career guidance."

Topic 6 (Overcoming bias and stereotyping) was unclear to five respondents. Is this for students and staff? Who is to do this? Does this go under staff development or under topic 1? This must be clarified.

Cultural Studies

The average ratings on this scope for each group are presented in Table 3. For one group or the other, all three topics received a rating below 4.00.

TABLE 3
Project MERLIN Cultural Studies Scope Ratings

Cultural Studies Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Heritage and enrichment	11	1	5	4.09	1.58	12	1	5	3.50	1.62
2. Multiculturalism	10	1	5	4.00	1.63	12	1	5	3.83	1.47
3. Values clarification	10	1	5	3.90	1.37	12	3	5	4.42	0.67

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Topic 1 (Heritage and enrichment) either needs to be combined with topic 2 (Multiculturalism), or given subtopics (e.g., Puerto Rican, Mexican, Haitian). Topic 2 should either be renamed "Cross culturalism," or "Cross cultural communication" should be added as another topic. Six respondents suggested adding a topic on "Staff development/inservice."

Dropout Prevention, Credit Accrual and Graduation

The average ratings for each group on this scope are presented in Table 4. Both Consortium and non-Consortium members rated topic 3 (Cost effectiveness) below an average of 4.00. Five respondents questioned what this topic was trying to capture, while another suggested it belonged under the topic of Fiscal management in the Administration scope.

Non-Consortium members rated three other topics below 4.00: 9 (Prevocational guidance), 10 (Support services) and 11 (Vocational guidance). Several respondents feel these topics along with topic 2 (Career planning) belong under the Career Education scope. Others feel Counseling should be a separate scope and include topics 4 (Counseling techniques) and 9 (Prevocational guidance).

During the large group discussion it was suggested that the scope should simply be called Dropout Prevention, as credit accrual and graduation are topics under this scope. Also, the subtopics of "short term/summer programs" and "secondary/tutorial programs" should be added under topic 6 (Curricular design and development). In fact, it was generally felt that short term and long term projects should be cataloged separately.

TABLE 4
Project MERLIN Dropout Prevention Scope Ratings

Dropout Prevention Item	Consortium Members					Non-Consortium Members				
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Academic assistance/remediation and tutoring	11	1	5	4.27	1.27	12	4	5	4.58	0.51
2. Career planning	10	3	5	4.50	0.71	11	2	5	4.09	1.14
3. Cost effectiveness	10	1	5	3.80	1.23	12	1	5	3.83	1.34
4. Counseling techniques	10	2	5	4.40	0.97	12	2	5	4.25	0.87
5. Credit acquisition and exchange	10	2	5	4.40	1.26	12	2	5	4.42	0.90
6. Curricular design and development	10	3	5	4.50	0.71	12	3	5	4.42	0.67
7. GED instruction	10	4	5	4.50	0.53	12	4	5	4.58	0.51
8. Interstate/intrastate cooperation	11	2	5	4.55	0.93	12	2	5	4.17	0.94
9. Prevocational guidance	10	2	5	4.00	1.05	12	1	5	3.75	1.36
10. Support services	10	3	5	4.30	0.82	12	1	5	3.58	1.44
11. Vocational guidance	10	2	5	4.20	1.03	12	1	5	3.75	1.36

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The following topics were suggested as additions to this scope:

- o Adult basic education programs
- o Alternative high school programs
- o Job training and partnership opportunities
- o On-the-job training programs
- o Treatment and followup services
- o Programs for secondary schools
- o Work values clarification

Educational Programs

The responses for each group on the scope of Educational Programs is presented in Table 5 on the next page. Consortium members rated only three topics or subtopics below a mean of 4.00, while non-Consortium members rated twelve topics or subtopics this low.

Two of the three low ratings by Consortium members were echoed by the non-Consortium member ratings. These were for topic 2 (Affective education) and subtopic 9a (Make and take under the topic of Materials development). Affective education appears to be just rated low, while it was unclear why make and take materials were separated out and/or whether they belong under this topic.

Non-Consortium members rated topic 1 (Academic assistance/remediation) low, primarily because it is too broad and "covers everything that follows." They rated 3a-c (Art- dance, drama, and music) low as well with no reasons stated. They also rated topic 4 (Computer-assisted instruction) low.

Subtopics 6a-d (Early childhood- cognitive skills, developmental theory, evaluation and assessment, and psychomotor skills--gross/fine) all were rated low by non-Consortium members. During the large group discussion it was suggested that all of the subtopics under this topic be moved to topic 11 (MSRTS skills list). The following subtopics were suggested as additions to this topic:

- o ESL/bilingual
- o evaluation
- o home/school communication
- o parenting
- o parents as teachers

Several respondents suggested subtopics based on grade levels or other categories be developed for topics 10 (Math) and 13 (Science). Several suggested the same thing for topic 5 (Curriculum design), but another suggested each area already has been broken out.

TABLE 5

Project MERLIN Educational Programs Scope Ratings

Educational Programs Item	Consortium Members					Non-Consortium Members				
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Academic assistance/remediation and tutoring	11	2	5	4.36	1.03	13	1	5	3.77	1.42
2. Affective education	10	1	5	3.60	1.36	12	1	5	3.75	1.29
3. Art										
a. dance	10	2	5	4.20	1.14	12	1	5	3.83	1.11
b. drama	10	2	5	4.20	1.14	12	1	5	3.83	1.11
c. music	10	3	5	4.50	0.85	12	1	5	3.83	1.11
d. spatial/visual art	10	3	5	4.50	0.85	12	1	5	4.08	1.08
4. Computer-assisted instruction	11	2	5	4.36	1.03	12	1	5	3.75	1.42
5. Curriculum design	11	2	5	4.36	1.03	12	1	5	4.08	1.16
6. Early childhood										
a. cognitive skills	11	4	5	4.73	0.47	12	1	5	3.75	1.54
b. developmental theory	11	4	5	4.64	0.50	12	1	5	3.75	1.54
c. evaluation and assessment	11	4	5	4.73	0.47	12	1	5	3.75	1.54
d. psychomotor skills--gross/fine	11	4	5	4.73	0.47	12	1	5	3.75	1.54
e. research	11	3	5	4.45	0.69	12	1	5	4.08	1.31
f. socialization skills	11	4	5	4.73	0.47	12	1	5	4.08	1.31
7. Evaluation and assessment										
a. regular school term	11	3	5	4.45	0.82	12	2	5	4.33	0.89
b. summer term	10	3	5	4.60	0.70	12	2	5	4.33	0.89
8. Language arts										
a. listening	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	4	5	4.50	0.52
b. reading	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	4	5	4.50	0.52
c. speaking	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	4	5	4.50	0.52
d. writing	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	4	5	4.50	0.52
9. Materials development	11	1	5	4.00	1.41	11	1	5	4.00	1.34
a. Make and take	11	1	5	3.36	1.80	12	1	5	3.75	1.54
10. Math	10	4	5	4.80	0.42	12	1	5	4.08	1.38
11. MSRTS skills list										
a. Early childhood	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	3	5	4.50	0.67
b. English reading	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	3	5	4.50	0.67
c. Mini math	11	1	5	4.09	1.58	12	3	5	4.50	0.67
d. oral language	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	3	5	4.50	0.67
e. Spanish reading	11	1	5	3.82	1.66	12	1	5	4.17	1.19
12. Physical education	11	3	5	4.45	0.69	12	3	5	4.42	0.67
13. Science	11	1	5	4.36	1.21	12	2	5	4.08	1.00
14. Social studies	11	3	5	4.55	0.69	12	2	5	4.00	1.13
15. Staff development	10	1	5	4.20	1.32	11	1	5	3.91	1.38
16. Study skills	11	3	5	4.64	0.67	12	3	5	4.50	0.67
17. Testing										
a. procedures	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	4	5	4.50	0.52
b. selection	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	4	5	4.50	0.52

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There are a number of problems involving topic 11 (MSRTS skills list). The word "Mini" should be removed before "math" in 11c. Also, ten respondents suggested changing 11e Spanish reading) to something like "language other than English."

Non-Consortium members also rated topic 15 (Staff development) below 4.00. It was unclear whether this topic should have subtopics, or be placed as a subtopic under other areas. Also, topic 17 (Testing) should have the following subtopics: "evaluation" and "assessment based on language and culture."

The following additional topics are suggested:

- o Clarification of values
- o Curriculum planning/coordination/articulation
- o Handicapped services (laws/programs)
- o Instructional coordination (migrant program and regular instruction)
- o Health education (health promotion/disease pre-prevention/well being)
- o Individualized instruction/planning
- o Parent/home coordination (parent/teacher conferences)
- o Records management/systems for teachers
- o Research

English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education

The ratings for this scope for each group are presented in Table 6. Both groups rated topic 7 (Mainstreaming) well below an average of 4.00. It was decided during the large group discussion to eliminate this topic.

One additional topic was rated low by non-Consortium members. Topic 4 (Evaluation and assessment) apparently needs to be divided into subtopical areas.

Three additional comments related to topic 3 (ESL for special purposes) were suggested during the large group discussion. Levels 1-5 should be indicated as further breakdown topics for the subtopic of "illiteracy." "Native language" and "second language" should be breakdown topics under the subtopic of "remedial language instruction."

Additional comments recommended the following subtopics be added to topic 13 (Testing):

- o evaluation
- o placement
- o diagnostic techniques

Finally, five respondents suggested adding a new topic: "ESL/bilingual education certification and endorsement process."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 6
Project MERLIN Bilingual Education Scope Ratings

Bilingual Education Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Bilingual and bicultural counseling.....	11	1	5	4.09	1.30	11	2	5	4.09	1.14
2. Classroom activities and materials.....	11	1	5	4.00	1.55	11	2	5	4.18	0.87
3. ESL for special purposes										
a. content areas.....	11	1	5	4.36	1.21	11	4	5	4.36	0.50
b. illiteracy.....	11	1	5	4.00	1.61	11	2	5	4.18	0.87
c. remedial language instruction.....	11	1	5	4.00	1.55	11	4	5	4.36	0.50
d. vocational education.....	11	1	5	4.45	1.21	11	4	5	4.36	0.50
4. Evaluation and assessment.....	11	1	5	4.18	1.60	11	1	5	3.91	1.30
5. Instructional methods and program design.....	11	1	5	4.27	1.27	11	2	5	4.27	0.90
6. Linguistics.....	11	3	5	4.45	0.69	11	2	5	4.18	0.98
7. Mainstreaming.....	10	1	5	2.50	1.96	12	1	5	3.08	1.78
8. Program development.....	11	4	5	4.73	0.47	10	2	5	4.00	1.15
9. Program guidelines.....	11	3	5	4.45	0.69	10	2	5	4.10	0.99
10. Psychological factors										
a. effects of transiency.....	11	3	5	4.64	0.67	10	4	5	4.50	0.53
b. emotional and perceptual aspects....	11	3	5	4.64	0.67	10	4	5	4.50	0.53
c. motivation--intrinsic/extrinsic.....	11	1	5	4.27	1.27	10	4	5	4.50	0.53
11. Sociocultural factors										
a. adaptation/integration into mainstream.....	11	1	5	4.36	1.29	11	4	5	4.55	0.52
b. contemporary social problems.....	11	3	5	4.55	0.69	11	2	5	4.27	0.90
c. parental/cultural attitudes.....	10	3	5	4.60	0.70	11	2	5	4.27	0.90
d. teacher expectations.....	11	3	5	4.73	0.65	11	4	5	4.55	0.52
12. Staff development.....	11	1	5	4.36	1.29	9	4	5	4.33	0.50
13. Testing										
a. achievement.....	11	3	5	4.73	0.65	10	2	5	4.20	0.92
b. language assessment.....	11	3	5	4.73	0.65	10	2	5	4.20	0.92
c. psychological.....	11	3	5	4.64	0.67	8	2	5	4.00	0.93

Health and Human Services

The results for this scope for each respondent group are presented in Table 7. No topics or subtopics were rated below 4.00 on the average by non-Consortium members. However, Consortium members rated two topics this low: 2 (Community services) and 6 (Mental health and treatment). It was suggested that subtopics be added to each of these topical areas.

Topic 3 (Curriculum) should be called "Health curriculum" and topic 8 (Preventative programs) should be renamed "Prevention programs and services." Topic 1 (Clinics) is too broad and should have subtopics.

Topics 5 (Instruction) and 8 (Prevention programs and services) should be a single topical area and include all of the categories in the national survey as subtopics. These

subtopics should have breakdown topics of "prevention" and "service."

TABLE 7

Project MERLIN Health and Human Services Scope Ratings

Health and Human Services Item	Consortium Members					Non-Consortium Members				
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Clinics	10	2	5	4.20	1.03	12	2	5	4.25	1.06
2. Community services	10	1	5	3.80	1.40	13	2	5	4.15	1.14
3. Curriculum										
a. evaluation and assessment	10	3	5	4.60	0.70	12	3	5	4.58	0.67
b. materials development	10	3	5	4.60	0.70	12	3	5	4.58	0.67
c. program development	9	3	5	4.67	0.71	12	3	5	4.58	0.67
4. Immunization and screening	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	12	3	5	4.58	0.67
5. Instruction										
a. general health instruction	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	13	1	5	4.38	1.12
b. nutrition	10	4	5	4.80	0.42	12	4	5	4.67	0.49
c. pesticide use	10	4	5	4.80	0.42	12	4	5	4.67	0.49
d. sex education	10	4	5	4.80	0.42	12	4	5	4.67	0.49
e. water safety	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	13	1	5	4.46	1.13
6. Mental health and treatment	10	1	5	3.80	1.40	13	1	5	4.31	1.25
7. Physical health and treatment	10	1	5	4.20	1.48	12	2	5	4.42	1.00
8. Preventative programs										
a. child abuse and neglect	10	2	5	4.30	1.25	12	3	5	4.58	0.67
b. drug and alcohol abuse	10	2	5	4.30	1.25	12	3	5	4.67	0.65
c. teenage pregnancy	10	2	5	4.30	1.25	12	3	5	4.58	0.67

The following topics should be added to this scope:

- Available funding for health care
- Child abuse reporting systems
- Communication through MSRTS
- Free health resources
- Handicapped services
- Health values clarification
- Interagency communication (home/school/health provider
- Staff development
- State health care laws

Identification and Recruitment

The responses for each group on this scope are presented in Table 8. No average response was below 4.00.

During the large group discussion it was suggested that the scope be named "Student Identification and Recruitment." This would clarify several of the questions and support comments made by the respondents.

BEST COPY AVAIL

Topic 1 should be renamed "Family/student needs assessment techniques" and be placed under topic 4 (Training methods) as a subtopic.

Additional topics suggested were:

- o Geographical area
- o Interview techniques

TABLE 8
Project MERLIN Identification and Recruitment Scope Ratings

Identification and Recruitment Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Family needs assessment	11	3	5	4.55	0.69	11	3	5	4.73	0.65
2. MSRTS	11	1	5	4.00	1.61	11	2	5	4.45	0.93
3. Technical assistance										
a. eligibility criteria	11	3	5	4.64	0.67	12	4	5	4.75	0.45
b. forms design	11	3	5	4.64	0.67	12	2	5	4.42	0.90
c. on-site assistance	11	3	5	4.55	0.69	11	4	5	4.64	0.50
4. Training methods										
a. recruiter	11	1	5	4.27	1.27	12	2	5	4.58	0.90
b. records clerk	11	1	5	4.27	1.27	12	2	5	4.58	0.90

MSRTS

Responses for each group on this scope are summarized in Table 9. Consortium members rated topic 1 (Health matrix) below an average of 4.00. However, this was the only topic rated this low and there were very few comments in response to this scope.

TABLE 9
Project MERLIN MSRTS Scope Ratings

MSRTS Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Health matrix	11	1	5	3.91	1.45	11	4	5	4.64	0.50
2. Interstate/intrastate coordino	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	11	4	5	4.64	0.50
3. MSRTS basic skills list	11	2	5	4.64	0.92	11	1	5	4.27	1.19
4. Program funding	11	3	5	4.73	0.65	11	4	5	4.64	0.50
5. Secondary credit exchange	11	4	5	4.91	0.30	11	2	5	4.36	0.92
6. Student enrollment	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	11	4	5	4.64	0.50
7. Technical assistance	11	1	5	4.27	1.27	11	4	5	4.64	0.50
8. Test scores	11	2	5	4.45	1.04	11	3	5	4.36	0.67

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Parent and Community Involvement

The responses for each group to the topics under this scope are presented in Table 10. There were no topics rated below an average of 4.00, but there were numerous comments--both written and during the large group discussion.

TABLE 10
Project MERLIN Parent Involvement Scope Ratings

Parent Involvement Item	Consortium Members					Non-Consortium Members				
	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Community involvement	11	1	5	4.27	1.42	11	1	5	4.27	1.27
2. Community resources	11	1	5	4.45	1.21	11	4	5	4.82	0.40
3. Family environment	11	1	5	4.00	1.55	12	2	5	4.17	1.34
4. Parent attitudes	11	1	5	4.27	1.42	11	1	5	4.09	1.38
5. Parent organizations	11	3	5	4.73	0.65	11	2	5	4.55	0.93
6. Parent role and participation	11	4	5	4.91	0.30	10	3	5	4.70	0.67
7. Parent training	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	11	2	5	4.64	0.92
8. Relationships										
a. parent-child	11	2	5	4.64	0.92	12	2	5	4.50	0.90
c. parent-educator	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	2	5	4.50	0.90
c. parent-school	11	4	5	4.82	0.40	12	2	5	4.50	0.90

Topic 1 (Community involvement) is too broad and unclear and should be either deleted or be made more specific (e.g., "Community awareness") and placed under topic 4 (Relationships). The subtopics of "public sector" and "private sector" should be added under topic 2 (Community resources).

Topic 4 (Parent attitudes) should be omitted or combined with topic 3, which should be changed to "Family relationships and environment." Then, the new topic 3 becomes somewhat synonymous with topic 8 (Relationships). Another possibility is to call topic 3 "Improving parent participation in the school setting" and placing topics 4 (Parent attitudes), 5 (Parent organizations) and 7 (Parent training) as subtopics along with the new subtopic of "values clarification for parents."

Topics 5 (Parent organizations) and 7 (Parent training) need subtopics and topic 7 should be changed to "Parenting skills." Topic 8 (Relationships) should be renamed "Communication," with "parent-agency" added as a subtopic.

Finally, the following were suggested as additional topics:

- Research (4 respondents)
- Advocates/effective lobbyists
- Community organizations
- Needs assessment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- o Role of LEA and SEA
- o Staff development and training

Special Education

The responses for each group to this scope are summarized in Table 11. Once again there were no average ratings below 4.00 for either group.

TABLE 11
Project MERLIN Special Education Scope Ratings

Special Education Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Curriculum and instruction										
a. design and development	10	2	5	4.30	1.06	11	3	5	4.55	0.69
b. ESL/bilingual for the special student	10	2	5	4.30	1.06	11	3	5	4.55	0.69
c. individual educational program (IEP)	10	2	5	4.30	1.06	11	3	5	4.55	0.69
2. Gifted and talented										
a. high academic ability	10	2	5	4.10	1.10	11	2	5	4.36	1.03
b. high creative ability	10	2	5	4.10	1.10	11	2	5	4.36	1.03
3. Handicapped										
a. behaviorally disturbed	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
b. hearing impaired	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
c. learning disabled	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
d. mentally retarded	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
e. multiple handicapped	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
f. physically handicapped	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
g. speech impaired	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
h. visually impaired	10	4	5	4.70	0.48	11	3	5	4.45	0.69
4. Mainstreaming	10	3	5	4.40	0.84	12	1	5	4.08	1.16
5. Materials and equipment	10	2	5	4.10	1.10	11	2	5	4.18	0.98
6. Tests and measurements										
a. achievement	10	3	5	4.40	0.84	11	2	5	4.27	1.01
b. aptitude	10	3	5	4.40	0.84	11	2	5	4.27	1.01

For topic 2 (Gifted and talented), it was suggested that the following subtopic be added: "programs/services/laws in placement/referral/identification."

The major comments referred to the need for incorporating commitments made at a San Antonio, Texas workshop on handicapped migrant children. Codes as well as categories were developed which should be used in this scope. These categories are available through Barbara McCaffery in Geneseo, New York.

The following were suggested as additional topics:

- o Early identification
- o Identifying by putting in Health MSRTS form
- o IEP transfers with MSRTS
- o Interagency resources/services/coordination
- o Legal requirements

Vocational Education

A summary of the responses for each group on this scope is presented in Table 12. There were also no average ratings below 4.00 on this scope.

TABLE 12
Project MERLIN Vocational Education Scope Ratings

Vocational Education Item	Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.	Non-Consortium Members N	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std.Dev.
1. Apprenticeships	10	2	5	4.10	1.10	11	2	5	4.36	0.92
2. Business/education relationships	10	2	5	4.30	0.95	11	4	5	4.55	0.52
3. Certification and licensing	10	3	5	4.50	0.71	10	3	5	4.50	0.71
4. Cooperative education	10	3	5	4.40	0.70	10	3	5	4.50	0.71
5. Curriculum and assessment										
a. ESL/bilingual for vocational education	10	3	5	4.50	0.71	10	4	5	4.60	0.52
b. evaluation and assessment	10	3	5	4.50	0.71	9	4	5	4.56	0.53
c. highly skilled	10	4	5	4.60	0.52	10	2	5	4.30	0.95
d. methods and techniques	10	4	5	4.60	0.52	10	4	5	4.60	0.52
e. single skill operatives	10	2	5	4.30	0.95	10	2	5	4.20	1.03
f. technical occupations	10	4	5	4.60	0.52	10	3	5	4.40	0.70
6. Employment and training programs	10	1	5	4.40	1.26	10	4	5	4.60	0.52
7. Instructional materials design	10	1	5	4.40	1.26	10	2	5	4.30	0.95
8. Internships	10	1	5	4.30	1.25	10	2	5	4.40	0.97
9. Job placement and follow-through	10	3	5	4.70	0.67	10	3	5	4.50	0.71
10. Occupational psychology	9	2	5	4.22	1.09	10	2	5	4.00	1.25
11. Occupational sociology	9	2	5	4.22	1.09	10	2	5	4.00	1.25
12. School-to-work transition	10	4	5	4.60	0.52	10	2	5	4.30	1.06

The major concern about this scope is its integration with the scopes of Career Education and Dropout Prevention. There were very few comments in response to this scope. The only additional topic suggested was: "On-the-job conflict resolution/problem solving."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary

It was suggested that the ERIC Thesaurus be used as the basis for the categorization and retrieval system, replacing the currents scopes and topics. This methodology is recognized and provides for a hierarchical display of the relationship of concepts. A hierarchical thesaurus for Migrant Education has been developed and, although not yet available to the general public, could be shared with project staff. Project staff should secure and investigate the usefulness of this thesaurus although, if the following revisions are made based upon the responses to the Survey of Scopes and Topics, the existing system of scopes and topics probably would be adequate. Revision of the existing system also would eliminate the need for reclassifying people, programs and written materials which have already been placed on the database.

Based on the responses to the Survey of Scopes and Topics, there are six scopes which need major revisions: Administration, Cultural Studies, Dropout Prevention, Educational Programs, Parent and Community Involvement, and Special Education. In five other scopes, minor revisions are needed: Career Education, English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education, Health and Human Services, Identification and Recruitment, and Vocational Education. The Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) scope does not need any changes. In addition, there needs to be better articulation between the scopes of Career Education, Dropout Prevention and Vocational Education.